REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-11, 20, 22-25, 31-35 and 37-54 were rejected. All pending claims are believed to be clearly allowable over the cited art. Accordingly, their reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Claims 1-11, 20, 22-25, 31-35 and 37-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Skoolicas. The Skoolicas reference has been carefully evaluated, including the passages cited by the Examiner and the remainder of the reference. The reference does not disclose all of the steps or components of the pending claims. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims are requested based upon the remarks set forth below.

The application currently includes seven independent claims, namely claims 1, 20, 31, 34, 42, 47 and 50. Applicants note that claims 1, 20, 34, 42 and 50 are method claims, whereas claims 31 and 47 are system claims.

Claim 1 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

Claim 1 was analyzed by the Examiner in some detail. Applicants note that claim 1 was the only independent claim of the seven independent claims that was analyzed in any detail whatsoever. According to the analysis advanced by the Examiner, Skoolicas discloses all of the elements recited in claim 1. The Examiner did note that, however,

> "...the data included within the designation data qualifies as descriptive material since it is directed to the content of data, not structure or an action or step. The particular data stored does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention and is given little patentable weight."

Applicants assume that the note made by the Examiner was with regards to claim 3, which depends from claim 1, and adds that the designation data recited in claim 1 is representative of physical location of a device. The Examiner appears to have treated the device designation data of claim 1, and of other independent claims as summarized

below, in a similar manner, however. Specifically, claim 1 recites that a database is generated for an electrical system comprising a *plurality of programmable devices*, the database including *device designation data*. The memory objects within the devices are configured *by downloading at least the device designation data from the database*.

The method recited in claim 1, as described in the application, greatly facilitates programming of multiple programmable devices in an engineered electrical system, such as a motor control center. The devices include memory objects in which data is loaded *from a database* used to design and solicit orders for the system. Importantly, the data downloaded into the devices is *data from the database*, as recited in claim 1. The data is not only data indicated by the database.

In the system taught by Skoolicas, on the other hand, some programming of a microprocessor may be performed. In all of the passages relied upon by the Examiner, and indeed throughout the Skoolicas reference, the only programming that could be identified by careful analysis is programming of a microprocessor as set forth in column 34, lines 47-50. The passage cited by the Examiner in column 2 simply indicates that programming may be specified for a programmable memory device with output control information. Applicants note that such programming is not equivalent to downloading data *from a configuration database*. That is, accordingly to claim 1, data from the database is stored in memory objects of the devices. Moreover, the data is device designation data.

The application makes clear that device designation data relates to various attributes of the device itself, such as its function and physical location. Nothing in Skoolicas teaches or even suggests that actual data *from a database including device designation data is ever downloaded into a device*. One skilled in the art would merely glean from Skoolicas that programming defined in a specification can be loaded into a microprocessor. However, nothing in the reference indicates that this programming

would, should, or even could include designation data for the microprocessor itself. Given the teachings of Skoolicas, indeed, one skilled in the art would not glean that the power supplies or microprocessors programmed have anything to do with one another in a system, and thus would require any type of designation data.

Applicants further contend that the designation data provided in the database recited in claim 1 and downloaded into the devices as recited in the claim is much more than nonfunctional descriptive material. According to MPEP §2106 IV.B.1.(b),

> Descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101.

However, this section of the MPEP deals with descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way a process is performed. In the case of the pending claims, the data stored in the database and downloaded into the memory objects of the devices *does* exhibit a functional interrelationship with the way the devices operate. That is, as clearly set forth in the application, the presence of device designation data in the programmed devices permits a range of enhanced functions that cannot be obtained through prior art systems such as that taught by Skoolicas. These include the ability to interrogate the devices to determine their functional state, their identification, their function in the system, their physical location in the system, and so forth. The presence of this information might also permit the association of the devices with stored catalog and specification data, as well as pre-programmed virtual pages to display operational characteristics in real time and historically. In short, the provision of such data in memory objects of the devices provides considerable functional interrelationships that are important to the operation of the system.

Accordingly, Applicants stress that the device designation data that is incorporated directly from the database into the memory objects of the devices as recited in claim 1 should be given substantial patentable weight and clearly distinguish the recited method from the teachings of Skoolicas and other prior art of record. Applicants further contend that a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been made out against claim 1 or the claims depending therefrom. Their reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Claim 20 and the Claims Depending Thereform

Claim 20 was not addressed with any specificity by the Examiner. Rather, the Examiner simply referred to the rationale used to reject claim 1. However, claim 20 is not the same in scope as claim 1. Claim 20 recites that a system design database is generated that includes data representative of programmable components and component layout in an electrical system. Following assembly of the system components, the programmable components are programmed by downloading information *from the database into a programmable component.*

As noted above, the Skoolicas reference entirely fails to teach *downloading data from a design database* into programmable components. The mere fact that microprocessors can be programmed in accordance with design specification as taught by Skoolicas does not in any way indicate that data from a design database is input into the components. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been made out against claim 20 or the claims depending therefrom. Their reconsideration and allowance are therefore requested.

Claim 31 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

As regards claim 31, here again, the Examiner made no attempt to analyze this claim in any detail, preferring to depend upon the rationale used to reject claim 1. Claim 31 is a system claim and not a method claim. The system refers to generation of sales proposals and programming for a motor control center. Elsewhere in the Office Action, the Examiner seems to indicate that Skoolicas relates to programming a motor control centers. The reference has been reviewed in detail, however, and no reference whatsoever can be found to motor control centers or even specifically to a control of motors.

Moreover, claim 31 recites a database, a sales proposal module, and a component programming module. The database includes data representative of programmable electrical components comprising a motor control center, the function of the components in the motor control center, and the physical location of the components in the motor control center. Nothing in the Skoolicas reference can be found that indicates any information whatsoever regarding a physical location of components in a motor control center either as specified by the system manufacturing interface (SMI) or the computer integrated manufacturing (CMI) system described in the reference.

Moreover, claim 31 recites that the component programming module is adapted to access data from the database and to download the data into each programmable component. As noted above, Skoolicas entirely fails to teach a system in which data from a database is downloaded into programmable components, much less components of a motor control center. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been made out against claim 31. Claim 31 and the claims depending therefrom are therefore believed to be clearly patentable and their reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Claim 34 and the Claims Depending Thereform

Claim 34 recites a method for selling engineered electrical systems that includes generating a database for a plurality of programmable devices. The database includes designation data, and the designation data, in turn, includes physical location data for devices in the system. The system is then assembled and memory objects within the devices are configured by downloading at least *the device designation data from the database* into the memory objects. As noted above, Skoolicas does not disclose or even suggest downloading information from a database into memory objects of programmable devices. Moreover, the reference entirely fails to disclose or suggest downloading device configuration data from the database, particularly where the device designation data is representative of physical location.

Although the Examiner did not address claim 34 with any specificity whatsoever, Applicants note that, here again, the device designation data and particularly the data representative of physical location of the device in the system is far from nonfunctional descriptive information. Rather, the data is indicative of particular interrelationships within the system that facilitate important functionalities unattainable in systems in the prior art, particularly those of the type described in Skoolicas. Accordingly, the data downloaded from the database into the memory objects of the devices as recited in claim 34 must be given patentable weight.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of anticipate of claim 34 or the claims depending therefrom. Their reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Claims 42 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

Claim 42 recites a method for coordinating sales and manufacturing electrical systems. A system design database is generated, according to the claim, that includes data representative of programmable components and their layout in an electrical system. The programmable components are programmed by downloading a portion of the database into each programmable component. The claim further recites the actual programming of the components by downloading at least device designation data from the database.

As summarized above, Skoolicas entirely fails to teach or suggest at least the downloading of device data from a system design database. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been made out with respect to claim 42, and this and its dependent claims are believed to be clearly patentable over Skoolicas. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are requested.

Claim 47 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

Claim 47 recites an integrated system for generating sales proposals and for programming a motor control center. The system includes a database including data representative of programmable electrical components comprising the motor control center. A function of the components in a motor control center and a physical location of the components in the motor control center are included in the database. A component programming module is then recited that is adapted to access data from the database and to download the data into each programmable component.

Here again, Applicants note that claim 47 was not addressed with any specificity at all by the Examiner. Claim 47 recites subject matter substantially different from the other independent claims. For example, claim 47 recites that the database contains data representative of programmable electrical components of a motor control center, including a function of the components in the motor control center and their physical

location. Skoolicas entirely fails to teach these recitations. As noted above, Skoolicas does not relate to a motor control center at all, or in any way to the control of motors. Moreover, no database is generated by Skoolicas that includes functions of components in a motor control center or their physical location. Finally, as noted above, Skoolicas does not teach downloading data from a database into programmable components. Accordingly, claim 47 and the claims depending therefrom are believed to be clearly allowable over Skoolicas, and their reconsideration is requested.

Claim 50 and the Claims Depending Therefrom

Claim 50 recites a method for coordinating sales and manufacturing of electrical systems. The claim recites steps of generating a system design database including data representative of programmable components and component layout. The claim then recites assembling the system components in accordance with the component layout, and programming the programmable components by downloading at least the device designation data from the database.

As noted above, Skoolicas entirely fails to teach downloading designation data into programmable components. At best, Skoolicas suggests that microprocessors can be programmed in accordance with a specification. However, this in no way is equivalent to downloading data from a database, particularly a system design database directly into programmable components. As noted above, the programming of the components as recited in claim 50 enhances additional functionality unattainable in prior art systems, including that taught by Skoolicas.

Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been made out against claim 50. Its reconsideration and that of its dependent claims are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 12, 2004

Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS
ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, LLC
Patent Department/704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204
Attention: Mr. Alexander Gerasimow
Phone: (414) 382-2000